

REMARKS

This Preliminary Amendment is being submitted with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

The final Office action mailed on 4 August 2005 (Paper No. 103) has been carefully considered.

Claims 2, 3, 11, 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 are being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, claims 1, 4, 6 thru 8, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 23 are being amended, and claims 25 and 26 are being added. Thus, claims 1, 4 thru 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 20, 23, 25 and 26 are pending in the application.

It should be noted that independent claim 1 and 6 are being amended to improve their form and to add recitation of features previously set forth in the specification as originally filed (*see* Figure 3) and in other claims previously considered by the Examiner. Furthermore, independent claim 8 is being amended to include the recitations from dependent claims 13 and 15, while independent claim 16 is being amended to include the recitation from dependent claim 18, and independent claim 23 is being amended to include the recitation of dependent claim 24. Thus, these amendments do not raise new issues requiring further consideration or search by the Examiner, and accordingly this Amendment After Final should be entered.

In paragraph 6 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 6 and 7 under 35

U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) for indefiniteness. Claims 6 and 7 are being amended so as to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph).

In paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 thru 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112 (first paragraph) as containing the subject matter which is not contained in the disclosure. Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 are being amended so as to be consistent with paragraph 29 of the specification and Figure 3 of the application. Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 (first paragraph) no longer applies, and should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 9 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 thru 8, 16 and 18 thru 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Menez *et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083453 in view of Hetherington *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,469,713. In paragraph 10 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 10 thru 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Menez *et al.* '453 in view of Hetherington *et al.* '713, and further in view of Cheng, U.S. Patent no. 5,986,638. In paragraph 11 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 for alleged unpatentability over Cheng '638 in view of Hetherington *et al.* '713, and further in view of Bruck *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,008,836. For the reasons stated below, it is submitted that the invention recited in the claims, as now amended, is distinguishable from the prior art cited by the Examiner so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

The present invention relates to a computer system in which the on-screen display (OSD) language of the display apparatus is automatically made to conform to the operating

system (OS) language. In the conventional art, the OS language and the OSD language may be respectively changed, but the prior art does not disclose or suggest an arrangement or method wherein the OSD language is made to conform to the OS language.

In Menez *et al.* '453, the OS language and the audio language are changed by a single **manual** on-screen selection, but the OSD language is not **automatically** changed to conform to the OS language.

In Hetherington *et al.* '713, if the host gives information regarding language to a remote subscriber, a computer system accommodates the information and changes the OS language. The reference mentions change of the language information based on the information transmitted from an external source, but does not disclose or suggest that the OSD language is **automatically** changed to bring it into conformity with the OS language.

Furthermore, "first language information data" pointed out by the Examiner refers to the OS language, and so it is different from the input signal of a remote controller mentioned in Menez *et al.* '453. Although the user interface language of Hetherington *et al.* '713 may comprise the OS language, it is not obvious to combine Menez *et al.* '453 with Hetherington *et al.* '713.

The inventive feature, whereby the OSD is automatically set to be displayed by the OS language is very different from the prior art in which the OS language is changed manually in order to enable the host to communicate. Thus, the prior art does not achieve

the object, effectiveness and advantageous results of the invention.

Independent claim 1 is being amended to improve its form, to add recitation of a “determining” function of the OSD control section, and to recite that the OSD is automatically displayed in the first language (the OS language) when the first language is included in the plurality of languages as determined by the OSD control section. It is submitted that the invention recited in amended independent claim 1 is distinguishable from the prior art cited by the Examiner so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In paragraph 9 of the Office action, the Examiner argued that the microprocessor 415 of Menez *et al.* ‘453 generates a menu which enables the user to select the language for the OSD (*see* the second paragraph on page 6 of the Office action). Furthermore, the Examiner stated that a user can select the language for the OSD, “which inherently includes storing multiple languages in a storage for user selection” (quoting from the third paragraph on page 6 of the Office action). It is submitted that these statements of “inherency” by the Examiner are not supported by specific reference to the cited references or any other prior references. Thus, the statements constitute the expression of mere opinion on the part of the Examiner, and cannot provide a proper basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

On pages 8 and 9 of the Office action, with respect to dependent claim 4, the Examiner cited paragraphs 13-14 of Menez *et al.* ‘453 as disclosing “factory default language, generally US English” and also cited a statement to the effect that “a user could modify the default language” (*see* the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of the Office action).

The Examiner argued that this “suggests that if no selection or no way to select, the system will uses [sic] the default language, which reads on the claim” (quoting from page 9, lines 2-4 of the Office action).

It is respectfully submitted that a review of paragraphs 13-14 of Menez *et al.* ‘453 fails to reveal any language which contains the suggestion set forth by the Examiner in the second paragraph on page 6 of the Office action. That is to say, just because the patent makes reference to a “factory default” language, stating that this will generally be U.S.-English, and just because the paragraph cited by the Examiner refers to the possibility that a user could modify the default language, this does not amount to a disclosure of the feature, recited in claim 4, “wherein said OSD control section controls said OSD generating section to display said OSD by means of one of said second languages when said first language is not included in said plurality of second languages stored as determined by said OSD control section” (quoting from claim 4). Specifically, if one assumes that the “factory default” language cited in paragraph 13 of Menez *et al.* ‘453 corresponds to the recited “first language”, there is no disclosure or suggestion in the patent, or in any other reference, of the feature recited in claim 4, whereby an OSD generating section displays the OSD by means of one of the “second languages” (not set forth in Menez *et al.* ‘453) when the first language (presumably, “factory default” language) is not one of the second languages stored in a memory.

Independent claim 6 is being amended to improve its form and to recite (in the last paragraph) recitation of automatically displaying said OSD in said first language when the

first language is one of the plurality of second languages stored in memory so as to automatically set the language used in the OSD conform with the first language. Therefore, for the same reasons set forth above relative to independent claim 1, the inventive method as recited in independent claim 6, as now amended, is distinguishable from the prior art cited by the Examiner so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Independent claim 8 is being amended to incorporate the recitations from dependent claims 13 and 15, which are being canceled. Thus, independent claim 8 now recites the display device as comprising a memory for storing first and second language information data, and as further comprising a first key as previously recited in claim 15. For the same reasons set forth above relative to independent claims 1 and 6, the invention recited in claim 8 is distinguishable from the prior art so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103.

In previously rejecting dependent claim 11, in paragraph 8 of the Office action, the Examiner admitted that the combination of Menez *et al.* '453 and Hetherington *et al.* '713 did not disclose "said display device comprising a first key activating said OSD and a second key setting said display device" for the OSD features (quoting from page 17, lines 2-3 of the Office action). In that regard, the Examiner cited Bruck *et al.* '836 as disclosing the use of television controls for controlling and manipulating OSD controls (*see* page 17, lines 6-8 of the Office action). However, the Examiner did not cite any part of Menez *et al.* '453 or Hetherington *et al.* '713 which would motivate or instruct a person of ordinary skill in the art to seek and incorporate the disclosure of Bruck *et al.* '836. Thus, this combination of

references is not a valid combination and cannot provide a proper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

For the latter reasons, it is submitted that the invention, as recited in independent claim 8, is distinguishable from the prior art cited by the Examiner so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Independent claim 16 is being amended to incorporate the recitation from dependent claim 18, which is being canceled. Independent claim 16 now recites the display device as automatically displaying said OSD in one of said at least one second language when said first language information data is not included in said second language information data. This feature is not disclosed or suggested in the prior art cited by the Examiner.

Finally, independent claim 23 is being amended to include the language of dependent claim 24, which is being canceled. Furthermore, claim 23 now recites that the OSD is automatically displayed in the first language (the OS language) when the first language information data is included in the second language information data, similar to the recitations in claims 1, 6 and 8 (discussed above).

Therefore, for the same reasons as stated above relative to independent claims 1, 6 and 8, the invention recited in independent claim 23 is distinguishable from the prior art cited by the Examiner so as to preclude rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and early issuance thereof is solicited. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's attorney.

A fee for filing a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) accompanies this Preliminary Amendment. Should the check become lost, be deficient in payment, or should other fees be incurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56497
Date: 10/18/05
I.D.: REB/JGS